

## R E M A R K S

Applicant recognizes the restriction requirement and acknowledges the withdrawn claims. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings and rejected claims 22-49 under 35 USC §101, 35 USC §102 and under 35 USC §103. These objections and rejections are fully traversed below.

The claims have been amended to correct minor informalities and to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 37, 41, and 46 have been cancelled. Claims 22-36, 38-40, 42-45, and 47-49 remain pending.

Replacement drawings are submitted herewith. Applicant was unclear as to the corrections that needed to be made to the drawings. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests clarification if the corrected drawings are not adequate.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### REJECTION OF CLAIMS 22-38 AND 40-49

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-38 and 40-49 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,539,378, ('Gupta' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

The pending claims include two different sets of claims. Claims 22-35 relate to generating a structured organization and collaterally generating a description of how the semi-structured data is stored under the structured organization. Conversely, claims 36-49 relate to generating a semi-structured data organization for a collection of structured data and collaterally generating a description of correspondence between the generated semi-structured data organization and the collection of structured data.

Gupta fails to anticipate the claimed invention. Gupta relates to a method for creating an information closure model. See title. Gupta does enable the use of a relational database to organize information obtained from a semistructured source. See summary. However, the manner in which Gupta accomplishes this is entirely different from the claimed invention.

Gupta discloses generating a wrapper for extracting attributes of interest from semistructured information for incorporation into a relational database. See col. 8, lines 49-52. The wrapper extracts attributes of interest from the semistructured information and produces tuples, which may be provided to a relational database system. Once the wrapper for specific semistructured information is executed, a user may generate a relational database query which operates on the tuples produced by the wrapper. Accordingly, the relational database system views the semistructured information as one or more database tables as a result of the wrapper's processing. (Underline added.) See col. 8, lines 52-64.

It is important to note that the result produced by the wrapper is merely viewed as one or more database tables. However, the data is not actually stored in a database table. Moreover, Gupta fails to disclose or suggest collaterally storing a description of how the semi-structured is stored in the database tables.

The term "wrapper" is defined in col. 4, Table 1, of Gupta, as "A software layer that provides a relational database interface to information on a site." The examiner refers to col. 10, line 35 through col. 12, line 45, which relate to defining a wrapper, and indicates that Gupta discloses "creating relational storage tables." While Applicant acknowledges that a wrapper is generated and applied, Gupta neither discloses nor suggests generating a structured organization (e.g., creating relational storage tables) or indicating a correlation between the structured organization (e.g., relational storage tables) and semi-structured data. Rather, the wrapper of Gupta merely parses the semistructured information for attributes so that the attributes can be presented to a relational database system as tuples when the wrapper executes. See col. 10, lines 22-24. In other words, the wrapper of Gupta supplies information that appears to a relational database system to be a relational database, but the information is not, in fact, stored in a relational database. Stated another way, Gupta discloses the possibility that the information obtained by a wrapper may be incorporated into a relational database. See col. 4, lines 11-48. However, Gupta fails to disclose the generation of a structured organization such as a relational database. As such, there is no need to generate a correlation between a structured organization between a relational database and

semi-structured data or a semi-structured organization, or indicate how the semi-structured data is stored in the structured organization. In view of this, Gupta teaches away from the claimed invention.

The converse argument is also applicable here. While Gupta does disclose a semi-structured organization that is being parsed, Gupta fails to disclose or suggest the generation of a semi-structured organization and a correlation between the semi-structured organization and data obtained from a structured organization in the manner claimed.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the independent claims are patentably distinct from Gupta. In addition, it is submitted that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct for at least the same reasons. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from Gupta. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102.

The Examiner rejected claim 39 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Kasukawa et al, "*A New Method for Maintaining Semi-Structured Data described in XML*," ('Kasukawa' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

Kasukawa merely discloses the use of XML for the generation of semi-structured data. Kasukawa fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 39 is patentable over the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 39 under 35 USC §103(a).

## **SUMMARY**

An early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. ACTUP008X1).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Elise R. Heilbrunn', written over the firm name.

Elise R. Heilbrunn  
Reg. No. 42,649

PO Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100